

Adjustments of Modality in Postbyzantine Heirmologion

My original purpose was to demonstrate the line of evolution that connects the Postbyzantine tradition of the Heirmologion with the Byzantine *automela* cycle, the latter appearing in a few manuscripts from the 14th-15th century¹, in terms of their diverging modal characteristics in comparison to the classical Heirmologion and Sticherarion. The expression “adjustments of modality” may underline the fact that there is no change in the theoretical system of Oktaechia, but rather a development of the melodic material, which shows certain new modal behaviours. I realized, however, that most of the “peculiar” modal features of the automela, shared to some extent by the Stichera Anastasima from the “marginal” repertoire of the Sticherarion² (in the first three authentic modes only), are already present in that branch of the heirmological tradition, which is brought in connection with the name of John Koukouzeles.

I am referring, of course, to the less studied of the two distinct melodic versions of the Byzantine Heirmologion, the one represented among other manuscripts by Petrop. gr. 121 (A.D. 1302) and Sinai 1256 (A.D. 1309), namely the two sources that are believed to transmit a redaction by John Koukouzeles³. The existence of somewhat earlier Heirmologia with related melodic variants, like Sinai 1258 (A.D. 1257), shows that Koukouzeles wanted possibly to normalize an already existing tradition, perhaps with some modifications of his own. The other version is the so-called “classical” one, which can be found in well-known manuscripts like Iviron 470 (12th c.) or Grottaferrata E,γ,II (14th c.). Although there are only minor melodic differences between the two “Koukouzelian” manuscripts, the written tradition of the “classical” version appears generally more stable and uniform than its counterpart, perhaps because it was significantly earlier codified⁴. Nevertheless, the “Koukouzelian” version, even if there is no trace of it before the middle of the 13th century, was most likely predominant after 1300.

¹ C. Troelsgård, “The Repertoires of Model Melodies (Automela) in Byzantine Musical Manuscripts”, *Cahiers de l’Institut du Moyen-Âge Grec et Latin* 71 (2000), pp. 3-27.

² O. Strunk, “Melody Construction in Byzantine Chant”, in his *Essays on music in the Byzantine World*, New York 1977, pp. 191-201, esp. 196-197.

³ A full description of Petrop. gr. 121 in E. Gertsman, *Tὰ ἑλληνικὰ μουσικὰ χειρόγραφα τῆς Πετρούπολεως. Κατάλογος. Τόμος Α'*, Έθνική Βιβλιοθήκη Ρωσίας, St. Petersburg 1996, pp. 127-156. See also *ibid.*, pp. 157-158, description of a fragment from Sinai 1256, which was cut off by P. Uspenskij and is kept now in the same library (St. Petersburg, Public Library of Russia), having the number: gr. 371.

⁴ O. Strunk, “Melody Construction...”, pp. 198-201.

It is evident, on the other hand, that today's melodic tradition of the Heirmologion does not go directly back to the Byzantine period, but to a younger version, which emerged during the 16th century. The latter is characterized by a series of totally new modal features, concerning the recitation- and cadence-tones, the ambitus and the melodic formulas. We are at present not in position to determine the earliest sources of this new idiom, yet the first signed settings of the Postbyzantine Heirmologion, by Theophanes Karykes⁵ and the monk Ioasaph (the so-called "new Koukouzeles")⁶ respectively, both about 1600, demonstrate the change quite clearly. And even if the melodic tradition is in no way uniform in this early stage, the new modality appears from the beginning completely crystallized and remains till nowadays unchanged.

The Heirmologion of Balasios "the priest" (2nd half of the 17th century), unlike the former two, for which only few copies exist, achieved wide circulation and brought a stability in the written tradition. Nevertheless, the melodies (but not the modality) kept changing and this Heirmologion was superseded by Petros Peloponnesios' setting in the second half of the 18th century. All these settings were seemingly intended for an "argon" interpretation, meaning in this case a neumatic way of singing, based on a double time value for each syllable in comparison to the syllabic style, as the "exegeses" of the 18th-19th century show. Nevertheless, it has been proven that certain chants could be interpreted in both ways, syllabic or neumatic, using the same musical text⁷. A purely syllabic Heirmologion was presented for the first time after the Byzantine period by Petros Byzantios about the end of the 18th century. The melodies recorded by this composer as well as their "argon" counterparts, recorded by his teacher Petros Peloponnesios, are still in use today, with certain minor modifications. The positioning of the heirmological melodies in the Chrysanthine system after 1814, which has been the cause of much confusion regarding the modality, is nothing but an attempt to fit the already existing melodic material into the new theoretical framework⁸.

I will try to show now that the "Koukouzelian" version forms actually the first stage of the development process which leads finally to the Postbyzantine Heirmologion, in terms of the changes in modality. This would mean also that the specific version of the Byzantine Heirmologion was beyond any doubt the dominant one in the last years of the Empire or even

⁵ Cod. Athos, Xenophontos 159 is the only dated copy (A.D. 1607). See M. Χατζηγιακούμης, Χειρόγραφα ἐκκλησιαστικῆς μουσικῆς 1453-1820, Athens 1980, pp. 123-124 and facs. 20. Γρ. Στάθης, Τὰ χειρόγραφα βυζαντινῆς μουσικῆς. Αγιον Όρος, vol. 2, Athens 1976, pp. 123-125.

⁶ There is only one known copy of this Heirmologion, Cod. Athos, Laura K 158 (not dated).

⁷ E. Μακρής, "Καταγραφές ἑλληνικῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν μελῶν ἀπὸ τὸν F.J. Sulzer", *Μουσικὸς Λόγος* 5 (Summer 2003), pp. 3-11.

some time after its fall. I will use one Heirmos for each mode as example (the *nana* included, as a branch of the fourth plagal mode), in all three versions: classical, Koukouzelian and Postbyzantine. As I have already explained, the Postbyzantine tradition does not correspond to a uniform melodic version, yet the modal behavior of the melodies remains stable through the time. So there is no reason not to use the purely syllabic version by Petros Byzantios (let's call it “Neobyzantine”) for our comparison⁹, even if it stands at the end of the evolution line. It is a quite impressive fact that, in spite of the long time distance between the Koukouzelian and the Neobyzantine version, many phrases are practically identical in both of them. See, for instance, in Example 1 the phrases: ἐκ τῆς Παρθένου ἀνεβλάστησας and Δόξα τῇ δυνάμει σου, Κύριε. The careful reader will discover many similar cases in our examples.

Before we proceed to the examples, it is useful to mention some general tendencies. The first of them has to do with the melodic style: in the two younger versions the melodies are much simpler than in the “classical” one, almost strictly syllabic, which means also a closer dependence of music on the text. Especially the Neobyzantine version is quite consistent in the correct musical accentuation of the poetical text. If we add the increased presence of the characteristic recitation tones of each mode in both versions, the impression of a certain influence from the ekphonetic style is created. But we should not concentrate on this now, since the new modal features, which are of interest in this contribution, affect the “argon” versions (not presented here) as well.

The second general tendency has a modal character: in all modes except the Barys, the Neobyzantine version pushes the register of the melody upwards, exceeding frequently the classical ambitus of the modes. But the first step in this direction was already made by the Koukouzelian version, which, despite the fact that it persists in the “normal” ambitus, it uses to focus on the upper register of each mode. This is especially manifest in the authentic modes, where the usual cadences on the respective plagals or even the use of the tone lying a 5th below the basis are extremely rare in the younger versions. This is actually a new understanding of the Byzantine modes, according to which the melody develops mainly *above* the basis tone or *around* it and only rarely *below*. It is very difficult to find an explanation for this phenomenon. Perhaps it is in some way related to the heritage of *kalophonia*.

⁸ E. Makris, “The Significance of Pitch in the ‘New Method’ of Greek Church Music”, *New Sound. International Magazine for Music* 16 (2000), pp. 88-96.

⁹ Transcribed into the notation of the New Method after 1814 by Chourmouzios Chartophylax.

It is absolutely necessary at this point to remark that our examples for the first two plagal modes do not reflect the general situation regarding the Koukouzelian version; they are rather selected cases, which seem to anticipate the later development.

In the following examples the Neobyzantine melodies, transcribed from their New Method version, have been transposed into the “natural” bases of the modes, in order to facilitate the comparison. The original starting tones, which are noted at the beginning of each piece, must not be confused with the original Chrysanthine basis tones. In Example 1, for instance, “originally from *a*” means that the chant starts in the New Method from *a* instead of *e*, but the basis tone is *D*, a 5th lower.

The reconstruction of rhythm in the two older versions follows actually the modern practice of using alternating two-beat and three-beat units, while van Biezen’s and Arvanitis’ theories of a basically binary rhythm¹⁰ have been taken seriously into account in certain important matters, such as the rhythmical rendering of the *diplé*-combinations. The *tzakisma* remains an enigmatic sign, which seems to be either a relic of older notational practices or an ornamental symbol with uncertain effect, so we preferred to ignore it in this transcription. But a thorough discussion of such issues would be out of the scope of this paper.

Sources of examples 1-9:

C(lassical version): Grottaferrata E, γ ,II (A.D. 1281)¹¹, ff. 17^r, 29^v, 65^r, 126^r, 129^r, 162^{r-v}, 215^r, 253^r and 251^r respectively.

K(oukouzelian version): Petropolitanus graecus 121 (A.D. 1302), ff. 11r, 30v, 51r-v, 67r, 88r, 98v, 112v, 133r and 131v respectively.

N(eobyzantine version): Heirmologion of Petros Byzantios, 1st ed.¹², pp. 11, 48, 60-61, 74, 93-94, 109, 120-121, 138-139 and 146 respectively.

¹⁰ J. van Biezen, *The Middle Byzantine kanon-notation of Manuscript H. A palaeographic study with a transcription of the melodies of 13 kanons and a triodion* [dissertation], Bilthoven 1968. Ι.Β. Αρβανίτης, “Η ρυθμική και μετρική δομή των βυζαντινών είρμων και στιχηρῶν ὡς μέσο και ὡς ἀποτέλεσμα μιᾶς νέας ρυθμικῆς ἐρμηνείας τοῦ βυζαντινοῦ μέλους”, in: E. Μάκρης (ed.), *Οἱ δύο ὄψεις τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς μουσικῆς κληρονομίας. Αφιέρωμα εἰς μνήμην Σπυρίδωνος Περιστέρη* [acts of a meeting held by the Academy of Athens in 2000], Athens 2003, pp. 151-176. Also available in English: I. Arvanitis, “The Rhythmical and Metrical Structure of the Byzantine Heirmoi and Stichera as a Means to and as a Result of a New Rhythmical Interpretation of the Byzantine Chant”, *Acta Musicae Byzantinae* 6 (2003), pp. 14-29.

¹¹ Facsimile edition by L. Tardo, *Hirmologium Cryptense* (Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae 3), Rome 1950.

¹² Είρμολόγιον τῶν Καταβασιῶν Πέτρου τοῦ Πελοποννησίου μετὰ τοῦ συντόμου Είρμολογίου Πέτρου πρωτοψάλτου τοῦ Βυζαντίου [...], Constantinople 1825, reprint [Athens 1982]. The second part of the book (Heirmologion of Petros Byzantios) has separate page numbering.

Example 1

The image shows three staves of musical notation for the 4th Ode of the first Canon for Christmas, arranged vertically. Each staff has lyrics written below it in Greek. The notation uses a soprano C-clef, common time, and a key signature of one sharp (F#). The first staff is labeled "Classical", the second "Koukouzelian", and the third "Neobyzantine (originally from a)". The lyrics are as follows:

"Classical"

Πά - βδος ἐκ τῆς ρί - ζης ι - εσ - σαι και ἀν - θος ἐξ αὐ - τῆς, Χρι -
στέ, ἐκ τῆς Παρ - θε - νου ἀν - ε - βλά στη - σας ἐξ ὄ - ρους ὁ αι - νε - τός, Κα - τα -
σκι - ου δα - σέ - ος, ἥλ - θες σαρ - κω - θεις ἐξ ἀ - πει - ράν - δρου, ὁ ἄ - α - υ - λος και Θε -
ός. Δό - ξα τῇ δυ - νά - μει σου, Κύ - ρι - ε.

"Koukouzelian"

Πά - βδος ἐκ τῆς ρί - ζης ι - εσ - σαι και ἀν - θος ἐξ αὐ - τῆς, Χρι -
στέ, ἐκ τῆς Παρ - θε - νου ἀν - ε - βλά - στη - σας ἐξ ὄ - ρους ὁ αι - νε - τός, Κα - τα -
σκι - ου δα - σέ - ος, ἥλ - θες σαρ - κω - θεις ἐξ ἀ - πει - ράν - δρου, ὁ ἄ - α - υ - λος και Θε -
ός. Δό - ξα τῇ δυ - νά - μει σου, Κύ - ρι - ε.

Neobyzantine (originally from a)

Πά - βδος ἐκ τῆς ρί - ζης ι - εσ - σαι και ἀν - θος ἐξ αὐ - τῆς, Χρι -
στέ, ἐκ τῆς Παρ - θε - νου ἀν - ε - βλά - στη - σας ἐξ ὄ - ρους ὁ αι - νε - τός, Κα - τα -
σκι - ου δα - σέ - ος, ἥλ - θες σαρ - κω - θεις ἐξ ἀ - πει - ράν - δρου, ὁ ἄ - α - υ - λος και Θε -
ός. Δό - ξα τῇ δυ - νά - μει σου, Κύ - ρι - ε.

Ex. 1: Heirmos of the 4th Ode of the first Canon for Christmas (by Kosmas of Jerusalem), first mode.

C: moving around *a*, makes cadence also on *D*.

K: about the same ambitus, focuses on the upper register *G-d*, dominant tones¹³ *a, c*, secondarily also *d*.

N: register pushed further upwards, dominant tones *a, d*. Basis tone positioned on *D* (a 5th lower) in the Chrysanthine system.

The new reality in the first mode (tonal centers *a-d*, in the New Method: *D-G*) is already present in the Byzantine stichera automela. See Example 10.

¹³ From now on we use the Chrysanthine term “dominant tones” (*δεσπόζοντες φθόγγοι*) as more appropriate, instead of “recitation tones”.

Example 2

"Classical"

"Koukouzelian"

Neobyzantine
(originally from D)

Av - tí - thε - on πρόσταγ - ma πa - ra - vo - moúν - των tu -
rάν - νων μετ - áρ - σι - on tήn φλό - γa aν - ερ - rí - pi - se' Xri - stόs δe éph - ή - plω -
σe θe - o - se - bέ - si πai - si δρό - σon tήn tού πneύ - ma - tos, ó ώn eύ -
λo - γη - μé - νoς kai ú - pеr - év - dо - ξoς.

Av - tí - thε - on πρόσταg - ma πa - ra - vo - moúν - των tu -
rάν - νων μeτ - ár - si - on tήn φlό - γa aν - εr - rí - pi - se' Xri - stόs δe éph - ή - plω -
σe θe - o - se - bέ - si πai - si δrό - sοn tήn tού πneύ - ma - tos, ó ώn eύ -
λo - γη - μé - νoς kai ú - pеr - év - dо - ξoς.

Av - tí - thε - on πρόσταg - ma πa - ra - vo - moúν - των tu -
rάn - νou μeτ - ár - si - on tήn φlό - γa aν - εr - rí - pi - se' Xri - stόs δe éph - ή - plω -
σe θe - o - se - bέ - si πai - si δrό - sοn tήn tού πneύ - ma - tos, ó ώn eύ -
λo - γη - μé - νoς kai ú - pеr - év - dо - ξoς.

Ex. 2: Heirmos of the 7th Ode of the Resurrection Canon from the Oktoechos (by John Damascene), second mode.

C: *b* is the axis of the melody, wide range, final cadence on the plagal.

K: like in the first mode; focuses on the upper register, dominant tones *b*, *d* (*sharp*)¹⁴, secondarily also *e*.

The specific idiom (tonal centers *b-d sharp*) is still present today in the stichera automela Ὁτε ἐκ τοῦ ξύλου and Οἶκος τοῦ Εφραθᾶ (*D-F sharp* in the New Method).

N: like in the first mode. Register pushed further upwards, dominant tones *b*, *e*. Basis tone positioned on *D* (a 6th lower) in the Chrysanthine system.

¹⁴ For the chromatic intervals see E. Makris, "The Chromatic Scales of the Deuteros Modes in Theory and Practice", *Plainsong and Medieval Music* 14/1 (April 2004), pp. 1-10.

Example 3

"Classical"

Xέρσον ἀ - βισ - σο - τό - κον πέ - δον ἡ - λι - ος ἐπ - ε - πό - λευ -
σε πο - τέ' ώσ - ει τεῖ - χος γάρ ἐ - πά - γη ἐ - κα - τέ - ρω - θεν ū -
ωρ, λα - φ πε - ζο - πον - το - πο - ροῦν - τι και θε - α - ρέ - στως μέλ - πον - τι'
ἄ - σω - μεν τῷ Ku - rí - ω, ἐν - δό - ξως γάρ δε - δό - ξα - σται.

"Koukouzelian"

Xέρσον ἀ - βισ - σο - τό - κον πέ - δον ἡ - λι - ος ἐπ - ε - πό - λευ -
σε πο - τέ' ώσ - ει τεῖ - χος γάρ ἐ - πά - γη ἐ - κα - τέ - ρω - θεν ū -
δωρ, λα - φ πε - ζο - πον - το - πο - ροῦν - τι και θε - α - ρέ - στως μέλ - πον - τι'
ἄ - σω - μεν τῷ Ku - rí - ω, ἐν - δό - ξως γάρ δε - δό - ξα - σται.

Neobyzantine
(originally from G)

Xέρσον ἀ - βισ - σο - τό - κον πέ - δον ἡ - λι - ος ἐπ - ε - πό - λευ -
σε πο - τέ' ώσ - ει τεῖ - χος γάρ ἐ - πά - γη ἐ - κα - τέ - ρω - θεν ū -
δωρ, λα - φ πε - ζο - πον - το - πο - ροῦν - τι και θε - α - ρέ - στως μέλ - πον - τι'
ἄ - σω - μεν τῷ Ku - rí - ω, ἐν - δό - ξως γάρ δε - δό - ξα - σται.

Ex. 3: Heirmos of the 1st Ode of the Canon for Υπαπαντή (the Presentation of Christ), by Kosmas of Jerusalem, third mode.

C: alternation of basis tone and *mesos* cadences (*c-a*) important in all three versions. Final cadence on the plagal.

K: like in the previous modes: focuses on the upper register and develops a new dominant tone not on the third, but on the second degree (*d*), while *e* is also present.

N: like in the previous modes. Register pushed further upwards, dominant tones *a*, *e*. Basis tone positioned on *F* (a 5th lower) in the Chrysanthine system.

Example 4

"Classical"

Ἐρ·ρη - ἔε γα - στρός ἡ - τε·κνω - μέ - νης πέ·δας, ὕ - βριν τε δυσ -
κά - θε - κτον εύ - τε·κνου - μέ - νης, μό - νη προσ - ευ - χὴ τῆς προ - φή - τι·δος
πά - λαι Ἀν·νης, φε - ρού·σης πνεῦ·μα συν - τε·τριμ - μέ - νον, πρὸς τὸν δυ -
νά·στην καὶ θε - ὀν τῶν γνώ - σε - ων.

"Koukouzelian"

Ἐρ·ρη - ἔε γα - στρός ἡ - τε·κνω - μέ - νης πέ·δας, ὕ - βριν τε δυσ -
κά - θε - κτον εύ - τε·κνου - μέ - νης, μό - νη προσ·ευ - χὴ τῆς προ - φή - τι - δος
πά - λαι Ἀν·νης, φε - ρού·σης πνεῦ·μα συν - τε·τριμ - μέ - νον, πρὸς τὸν δυ -
νά·στην καὶ θε - ὀν τῶν γνώ - σε - ων.

Neobyzantine

8 Ἐρ·ρη - ἔε γα·στρός ἡ - τε·κνω - μέ·νης πέ - δας, ὕ - βριν τε δυσ -
8 κά - θε - κτον εύ - τε·κνου - μέ - νης, μό - νη προσ·ευ - χὴ τῆς προ - φή - τι - δος
8 πά - λαι Ἀν·νης, φε - ρού - σης πνεῦ - μα συν - τε·τριμ - μέ - νον, πρὸς τὸν δυ -
8 νά - στην καὶ θε - ὀν τῶν γνώ - σε - ων.

Ex. 4: Heirmos of the 3rd Ode of the iambic Canon for Pentecost (probably by John Damascene), fourth mode.

C: moves around d, but e is also important.

K: melody focuses more on e, resulting a *legetos* colour in certain passages. Reminds of the alternation of d and e in some Neobyzantine Heirmoi, like *Ἄπας γηγενής*.

N: e becomes basis tone (*legetos* mode), register pushed upwards, further dominant tone: g. Basis tone positioned an octave lower in the Chrysanthine system.

Example 5

"Classical"

"Koukouzelian"

"Neobyzantine"

Ὕμνον

Ex. 5: Heirmos of the 1st Ode of the Resurrection Canon from the Oktoechos (by John Damascene), first plagal mode.

C: dominant tones *D, F, a*, no difference from the classical Sticherarion.

K: melody moves around the fifth degree (*a*), focusing again on the upper register without changing the range significantly. Final cadence on *G*. This idiom is still alive today in the sticherón automelon *Xαίροις ἀσκητικῶν* and in other isolated cases, among them the very popular melodies for *Χριστὸς ἀνέστη* and the “Ἐγκώμια” of Holy Saturday.

N: register pushed upwards, *a* becomes basis tone, further dominant tone: *c*, exactly like the Koukouzelian first authentic mode.

Example 6

The image shows three staves of musical notation for the Heirmos of the 6th Ode of the Resurrection Canon from the Oktoechos. The top staff is labeled "Classical", the middle "Koukouzelian", and the bottom "Neobyzantine (originally from F)". Each staff consists of two systems of music. The lyrics are written below each staff in Greek. The notation uses a soprano clef, common time, and various note heads and stems.

"Classical"

Toū βί - ου τήν θά - λασ - σαν ú - ψου - μέ - νην καθ - ο -
ρῶν τῶν πει - ρα - σμῶν τῷ κλύ - δω - νι τῷ εύ - δί - ω λι - μέ - νι σου
προσ-δρα - μῶν βο - ω σοι' ἀν - á - γα - γε ἐκ φθο - ρᾶς τῇν ζω - ήν μου,
πο - λυ - ε - λε - ε.

"Koukouzelian"

Toū βί - ου τήν θά - λασ - σαν ú - ψου - μέ - νην καθ - ο -
ρῶν τῶν πει - ρα - σμῶν τῷ κλύ - δω - νι τῷ εύ - δί - ω λι - μέ - νι σου
προσ-δρα - μῶν βο - ω σοι' ἀν - á - γα - γε ἐκ φθο - ρᾶς τῇν ζω - ήν μου,
πο - λυ - ε - λε - ε.

Neobyzantine (originally from F)

Toū βί - ου τήν θά - λασ - σαν ú - ψου - μέ - νην καθ - ο -
ρῶν τῶν πει - ρα - σμῶν τῷ κλύ - δω - νι τῷ εύ - δί - ω λι - μέ - νι σου
προσ-δρα - μῶν βο - ω σοι' ἀν - á - γα - γε ἐκ φθο - ρᾶς τῇν ζω - ήν μου,
πο - λυ - ε - λε - ε.

Ex. 6: Heirmos of the 6th Ode of the Resurrection Canon from the Oktoechos (by John Damascene), second plagal mode.

C: dominant tones *E*, *G* (*sharp*)¹⁵, *a* (the *nenano*-tone), cadence also on the subtonic (*D*), no difference from the classical Sticherarion.

K: melody moves around the *mesos* [*G* (*sharp*)], further dominant tone *b*, *nenano* also important (once again: focusing on the upper register). Final cadence on the *mesos*.

N: register pushed lightly upwards, *b* becomes basis tone, *nenano* not present, final cadence on the *mesos*. Basis tone positioned on *G* (a 3rd lower) in the Chrysanthine system. The “soft” chromatic intervals of the tetrachord *b-e* (*G-c* in the New Method) are not indicated by special symbols in this transcription.

¹⁵ See note 14.

Example 7

"Classical"

"Koukouzelian"

Neobyzantine

Ex. 7: Heirmos of the 6th Ode of the Resurrection Canon from the Oktoechos (by John Damascene), *barys* mode.

C: dominant tones *F*, *a*, (*c*), no difference from the classical Sticherarion.

K: no change regarding the register, simple change of the dominant tones: *F*, *G*, *b flat*.

N: exactly like the Koukouzelian, only the characteristic cadence descending to C and ascending again to F is new (see phrase συμπλόοις ποντούμενος ἀμαρτίαις).

Example 8

"Classical"

"Koukouzelian"

Neobyzantine
(originally from a)

The lyrics for all three settings are identical:

'Ek - vo - on πρόσταγ - ma tu - rán - nou δυσ - σε - βοῦς λα - ούς é - κλό - νη - σε, πνέ - on á - pei - λῆς καὶ δυσ - φη - μí - ας θε - o - στυ - γοῦς ó - μωας τρεις παῖ - δας οὐκ é - δει - μά - τω - σε θυ - μὸς θη - ρι - ω - δης, οὐ πῦρ βρó - μι - on ἀλλ' ἀν - τη - χοῦν - τι δρο - σο - βό - λω πνεύ - ma - ti, πυ - ri συν - óν - τες é - ψαλ - λον ó ú - περ - ú - μνη - τος τῶν πα - té - ρων ἡ - μῶν Θε - óς, εύ - λο - γη - τὸς εἰ.'

Ex. 8: Heirmos of the 7th Ode of the Canon for the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (by Kosmas of Jerusalem), fourth plagal mode.

C: dominant tones: G, a, c (the *nana*-tone), d, only rarely b.

K: no movement below G; b becomes an important dominant tone between G and d, without replacing entirely a and nana. In many chants (but not in this one) b is found also as finalis.

N: register pushed upwards, dominant tones only G, b, d. Positioned on C (a 5th lower) in the Chrysanthine system. Final cadences on the third degree appear very rarely in this version (only in certain Heirmoi ending with an accented syllable).

Example 9

The image displays three staves of musical notation for the 9th Ode of the Canon. Each staff consists of a treble clef, a key signature of one sharp (F#), and a common time signature. The lyrics are written below each staff in Greek.

- "Classical"**: The first staff shows a traditional chant style with various note heads and stems. The lyrics are: Ku - pi - awς Θε - o - tó-kov σὲ ó - mo - lo - γοῦ - μεν oi δι - à σοῦ σε - σω - σμέ - νοι, Παρ - θέ - νε á - γνή, σùν á - σω - μά - τοις χο - ρεί - αις σὲ με - γα - λύ - νον - τες.
- "Koukouzelian"**: The second staff shows a chant style where the melody is more rhythmic and dynamic. The lyrics are identical to the "Classical" version.
- Neobyzantine (originally from F)**: The third staff shows a chant style with a higher register and a different note head shape. The lyrics are identical to the "Classical" version.

Ex. 9: Heirmos of the 9th Ode of the Canon for the Small Paraklesis to the Most Holy Theotokos, fourth plagal mode - *nana*.

About *nana*: In the old version the *nana-martyria* (or *phthora*) affects in most cases only isolated phrases and not the whole chant. In the Koukouzelian version *nana* starts to turn into an independent branch of the fourth plagal mode, similar to the third authentic (basis tone *c*); many chants start with *nana* and remain in it for their biggest part, although most of them end finally on the fourth plagal (*G* or *b*). Otherwise there is no difference in the modality between the two older versions (dominant tones *c* and *d*). In the Neobyzantine version the register is pushed again upwards and *d* is replaced by *e*, perhaps under the influence of the third mode. Its basis tone is positioned on *F* in the Chrysanthine system, following the low positioning of the fourth plagal mode.

Example 10

Athos, Dionysiou 570 (15th c.), f. 131^r

The image shows two staves of musical notation in neumatic script. The first staff begins with a sharp sign (F#) and consists of a series of vertical strokes and horizontal dashes. Below it is a line of Greek text in a formal script. The second staff continues the musical line and also has a line of Greek text below it. The third staff starts with a sharp sign (F#) and ends with a double bar line. The fourth staff begins with a sharp sign (F#) and ends with a double bar line. The fifth staff begins with a sharp sign (F#) and ends with a double bar line. The sixth staff begins with a sharp sign (F#) and ends with a double bar line.

Παν ευ φη μοι Μαρ τυ ρες υ μας ουχ η γη κατ ε κρυψεν αλλ
D D D E F G D E F G G G G F E F E D C

ου ρα νος υπ ε δε ξα το η νοι γη σαν υ μιν πα ρα δει σου
D E F G G E F E D E F F E D E D C D E F G F G

πυ λαι και εν τος γε νο με νοι του ξυ λου της ζω ης απ ο λαυ ε τε
a G G G G F E F E D G G G D E F G G F E F E D

Χρι στω πρε σθευ σα τε δω ρη θη ναι ταις ψυ χαις η μων την ει
F F E F E D E D C D E F E F D E F E D C E F

ρη νην και το με γα ε λε ος
G G F D E G F E D

Heirmologion of Petros Byzantios, 1st ed., Constantinople 1825, p. 148

The image shows two staves of musical notation in neumatic script. The first staff begins with a sharp sign (F#) and consists of a series of vertical strokes and horizontal dashes. Below it is a line of Greek text in a formal script. The second staff continues the musical line and also has a line of Greek text below it. The third staff starts with a sharp sign (F#) and ends with a double bar line. The fourth staff begins with a sharp sign (F#) and ends with a double bar line. The fifth staff begins with a sharp sign (F#) and ends with a double bar line. The sixth staff begins with a sharp sign (F#) and ends with a double bar line.

Παν ευ φη μοι Μαρ τυ ρες υ μας ουχ η γη κατ ε κρυψεν 9 αλλ
G a G F G F E F G a G G F F E D D

ου ρα νος υπ ε δε ξα το η νοι γη σαν υ μιν 9 πα ρα δει σου
E F G a G F F E D E G F E D D F G a F

πυ λαι και εν τος γε νο με νοι του ξυ λου της ζω ης απ ο λαυ ε τε
F G G F G G F F E D D G F E F G a G F F E D

Χρι στω πρε σθευ σα τε 9 δω ρη θη ναι ταις ψυ χαις η μων την ει
E F D E D D F G a G a b c b a G F G

ρη νην και το με γα ε λε ος
a G G F F E F E D

Ex. 10: Two versions of the sticheron automelon Πανεύφημοι μάρτυρες, showing similar modal characteristics.

Conclusion: The new modality of the Postbyzantine Heirmologion is not as new as one would expect. The roots of this change are quite evident in that version of the old Heirmologion, which was possibly established by Ioannes Koukouzeles. This fact would be much more visible to the younger generations of psaltai, if the New Method had not altered the natural relations of the modes, in order to bring them within an average vocal range.